

REMARKS

In response to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Communication (Examiner's Answer) dated December 22, 2006, claim 11 has been amended. Claims 11-20 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

Applicants note that the Examiner's Answer does not reject claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Applicants interpret this omission as a withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 as allegedly indefinite which was asserted during the final Office Action dated March 3, 2006.

Claims 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,990,583 to Matsayuma et al. (hereinafter Matsayuma). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 11, as amended, recites, "generating, by the registration authority, a signature to contents registered with the public key certificate." The registration authority generates "a certificate issuing request including the contents signed by the registration authority and the registration authority signature." The certificate issuing request is sent from the registration authority to the issuing authority. The claim further recites a step of generating, by the issuing authority, the public key certificate. The public key certificate includes the contents signed by the registration authority, the registration authority signature, issuing contents issued by the issuing authority, and an issuing authority signature to the contents signed by the registration authority, the registration authority signature and issuing contents issued by the issuing authority."

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). At a minimum, the cited prior art does not disclose (expressly or inherently) the above recited limitations.

The Examiner's Answer asserts, at pages 3 and 4, that Matsuyama teaches generating, by the registration authority, a certificate issuing request including the contents signed by the registration authority and the registration authority signature, citing Matsuyama FIG. 19; column 3, lines 22-40; column 22, lines 14-67; and column 23, lines 1-5. However, Matsuyama, at column 3, line 33, merely states "requests the public-key-certificate issuer authority to issue the public key certificate corresponding to the subject." Hence, at a minimum, Matsuyama does not teach or suggest a certificate issuing request including the following elements: the contents signed by the registration authority, and the registration signature as recited in claim 11.

Additionally, Matsuyama does not teach or suggest a public key certificate including the following elements: the contents signed by the registration authority, the registration authority signature, issuing contents issued by the issuing authority, and an issuing authority signature to the contents signed by the registration authority, the registration authority signature and issuing contents issued by the issuing authority, as recited by claim 11.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuyama does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 11.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as independent claim 11 is patentable for

Application No.: 10/076,624

the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon (claims 12-20) are also patentable.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 12-20 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 11.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Eduardo Garcia-Otero
Registration No. 56,609

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 KEG/EG:cac
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: February 22, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1350673-1.062807.0040